

Ser. No. 10/673,731

### Remarks

Claims 1-20 were pending in the application. Claims 1-20 were rejected. No claims were merely objected to and no claims were allowed. By the foregoing amendment, no claims are canceled, claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 12, 19 and 20 are amended and no claims are added. No new matter is presented.

### Claim Amendments

Upon review of the claims, it was noticed that there was no antecedent basis for "the user" in claim 4. The foregoing amendments add this to claim 1 and further add reference to the user in several of the dependent claims. In view of this amendment, claim 6 is amended to change "third party" to "person" to make clear that the person may be said user. Additional minor typographical errors have been corrected.

### Claims Rejections-35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins (U.S. Patent No. 6061681) in view of Romano et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6269366). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Collins discloses an on-line dating service including network hardware.

Romano et al. is quite vague. Even viewed with hindsight knowledge of the present invention, Romano et al. at most discloses a system that forms a composite image of: (1) a randomly selected prestored image; (2) a user-inputted image; and (3) a randomly selected prestored annotation. Given its broadest hindsight reading, if the first image was of a celebrity and the second image was of the user, the user could end up receiving a composited image of that user and the celebrity.

No suggestion has been cited to combine the references. However, this is not believed critical. Collins apparently has been cited for several basic hardware elements which, even if combined with Romano et al., do not suggest the present invention.

Claim 1 identifies "selecting a time designation associated with one or more photographs of the selected celebrity and one or more additional persons..." Neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest selecting a time designation. They fail to even

Ser. No. 10/673,731

identify any specific selection. Romano et al involves the antithesis of such selection. Romano et al involves the computer prompting the user to answer questions to create a user profile. The computer uses the profile to merely select a general grouping of images. Col. 3 ~lines 33-38 and 49. Romano et al. further requires randomness identified in that: "the random number generator 140 then randomly selects a particular image..." Col. 3, ~lines 51-52. The claimed invention is much more than merely "viewing photographs of people, places... and printing..." as asserted in paragraph #3 of the Office action.

Claims 2 and 3 respectively identify "accessing an event-specific site or page prior to accessing the list" and "accessing an organization-specific site or page prior to accessing the list." Neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest these.

Claim 5 identifies printing the photograph remotely and "providing instructions for delivery of said print."

Claim 6 identifies the instructions as being "for delivery of said print to a third party who is among the one or more additional persons in the photograph." No such delivery is suggested.

Claim 7 identifies "providing a payment for said print" and "receiving a receipt for said payment."

Claims 8 identifies that "said receipt indicates that at least a portion of the payment is tax deductible." The Office action read, "Tax exempt status is not given patentable weight..." Page.3. No reasoning is given for this failure to weigh the claim limitation. Clearly, in the claimed invention the tax exempt status is identified precisely for the reason of proving an itemized deduction as stated in the Office action. However, neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest that any part would/should be tax deductible. Thus they inherently can not disclose or suggest identifying the deductibility.

Claim 9 recites "identifying a name of at least one person of *the one or more additional persons* and specifying that the print bear the name of the identified at least one person and be autographed by the selected celebrity." These are additional persons who are actually in the selected photograph. Neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest these.

Independent claim 10 identifies selection "based upon identifying information comprising

Ser. No. 10/673,731

information associated with the time or time period the photograph was taken..." As noted above, neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest such selecting. The claim further identifies "permitting the user to specify that the photograph copy be autographed..." Independent claims 19 and 20 similarly identify autographing. Neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest this.

Claim 11 states that the identifying information further comprises "information identifying a particular camera or a particular photographer or a particular location from a plurality of cameras or photographers or locations at a given event." Neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest this. Neither have any apparent use for such information.

Claim 12 further identifies "permitting the user to select the selected public figure from a group of public figures; permitting the user to download a first quality of image of the selected photograph without charge; and permitting the user to purchase a second quality of the selected image, different from the first quality of image." Neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest this.

Claim 13 further identifies "providing the user with the option of selecting a name to which the public figure is to address the autograph." Neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest this.

Claim 14 further identifies "providing the user with the option of choosing from a finite pre approved selection of messages for the public figure to write with the autograph." Neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest this. This is clearly distinguished from the random selection of Romano et al.

Claim 15 further identifies "providing an indication that a portion of any purchase payment will be donated to charity." As noted relative to claim 8, neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest this.

Claim 16 further states that "the identifying information comprises an indicia of when the photograph was taken." Neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest this. Neither have any apparent use for such information.

Claim 17 further identifies "providing a receipt indicating an amount that is tax-deductible." As noted relative to claim 8, neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins,

Ser. No. 10/673,731

disclose or suggest this.

Claim 18 further identifies "permitting the user to select a charity to which a portion of a payment of the user will be donated from a finite group of charitable organizations." As noted relative to claim 8, neither Romano et al., nor its combination with Collins, disclose or suggest deductibility. Thus there is no further suggestion for the selection.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

William B. Slate

Applicant

Reg. No.: 37,238

Telephone: 203-777-6628

Telefax: 203-865-0297

Date: June 24, 2005